



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,404	12/14/2001	Thomas M. Laney	83682AEK	8712

7590 03/16/2004

Paul A. Leipold
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

PATTERSON, MARC A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1772

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/020,404

Applicant(s)

LANEY ET AL.

Examiner

Marc A Patterson

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

1. The 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejections of Claims 1 – 31, of record on page 2 of the previous Action, are withdrawn.

REPEATED REJECTIONS

2. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 1 – 31 as being unpatentable over Allen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,057,961), of record on page 5 of the previous Action, is repeated.

NEW REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With regard to Claim 1, the phrase ‘length of the microvoid’ is indefinite as it is unclear if the voids of each layer are of the same length. For purposes of examination, it will be assumed that the voids are not the same length, and the ‘length’ therefore defines an average size.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

5. Applicant's arguments with regard to the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejections of Claims 1 – 31, of record on page 2 of the previous Action, have been considered and have been found to be persuasive. The rejections are therefore withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with regard to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 1 – 31 as being unpatentable over Allen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,057,961), of record on page 5 of the previous Action, have been carefully considered but have not been found to be persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant argues on page 9 of Paper No. 10 that the rejection is improper because the claimed invention provides a diffusion advantage which is obtained by employing a variation of at least 28% in the voids, and that the advantage is not disclosed by Allen et al.

However, the diffusion advantage is not claimed. Furthermore, as stated on page 5 of the previous Action, the structural limitations of the claimed invention are rendered obvious by Allen et al, and it is not necessary for Allen et al to disclose the diffusion advantage which is obtained if the structural limitations of the claimed invention are anticipated or rendered obvious by Allen et al.

Applicant also argues, on page 10, that although the materials disclosed by Allen et al do cause light to diffuse, they are not effective as diffusers, per se.

However, if the materials disclosed cause light to diffuse, they clearly constitute diffusers and are therefore effective at diffusing light.

Applicant also argues on page 10 that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to provide multiple microvoided layers having distinctly different void sizes to achieve improved % diffuse transmission.

However, as stated on page 5 of the previous Action, Allen et al comprises a plurality of layers (column 22, lines 41 – 62) having a void geometry in which the frequency varies between at least two layers (column 22, lines 4 – 14). Allen therefore discloses the structural limitations of the claimed invention, and it is therefore not necessary for Allen et al to disclose the same intended use.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1772

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc Patterson, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3537. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached at (703) 308-4251. FAX communications should be sent to (703) 872-9310. FAXs received after 4 P.M. will not be processed until the following business day.

Marc A. Patterson, PhD.

Marc Patterson
Art Unit 1772


HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
1772

3/8/04